IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE

Writ Petition No.5195 of 2006

Rayat Shikshan Sanstha, Satara Petitioner

Vs.

Smt.Sunita Sambhajirao Thorat & anr. Respondents

Mr.R.V.More for petitioner.

CORAM: B.H.MARLAPALLE,J.

August 17, 2006.

P.C.

. Heard Mr.More, the learned counsel for the petitioners who are aggrieved by the order dated 16/9/2005 passed by the one member Grievance Committee constituted under the Shikshan Sevak Scheme. The respondent who was appointed as a Shikshan Sevak on 26/5/2002 had approached the Grievance Committee by filing Appeal No.39 of 2003 challenging the order of termination dated 26/9/2003. It was alleged in the said termination order that the respondent was appointed as a Shikshan Sevak while she had disclosed her name as Sunita Sambhajirao Thorat and before the said date of appointment she had already changed her name as Mrs. Sunita Ratan

Patil and thus she suppressed the material fact. The second charge against her was regarding her vocation as an agent of LIC prior to her appointment and during the tenure of Shikshan Sevak.

. In the impugned order the Grievance Committee has recorded that the respondent was known to the petitioners in asmuchas she was appointed on temporary basis much before she was appointed as a Shikshan Sevak and in fact she was married to the Principal of the very same school. In the application she had submitted for the post of Shikshan Sevak though she had given her name as Sunita Sambhajirao Thorat, she had also disclosed that she was married to Shri Ratan Patil who was the Principal of the said school. On the issue of being an agent of LIC the Grievance Committee noted that the respondent accepted the post of Shikshan Sevak from 1/7/2003 and she had resigned from the agency of LIC on 8/5/2003. Thus on both the counts the challenge to the order of termination dated 26/9/2003 was upheld.

. The reasoning set out by the Grievance Committee in support of its findings in the impugned

order cannot be termed as perverse or grossly erroneous so as to call for interference under Article 227 of the Constitution.

. Hence the petition is rejected summarily.

(B.H.MARLAPALLE,J.)